

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05305 01 OF 02 301241Z

46

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 NRC-05 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /088 W

----- 048996

O P 301137Z SEP 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3782

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 5305

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJ: MBFR: DEFINITION OF FORCES: SPC MEETING SEPTEMBER 29

REFS: A) USNATO 5257 DTG 261040Z SEP 75; B) USNATO 5208 DTG
241521Z SEP 75; C) STATE 224489 DTG 192339Z SEP 75; D) USNATO
5059 DTG 171433Z SEP 75

SUMMARY: AT SEPTEMBER 29 SPC MEETING, UK REP PROPOSED WORDING FOR
GUIDANCE TO AHG WHICH HE ACKNOWLEDGED HAD THE PURPOSE OF ENDING
THE DISCUSSION IN VIENNA ON ANOMALIES UNTIL THERE WAS AN EXCHANGE
OF DATA. UK WAS ISOLATED IN THIS POSITION. UK AND FRG CONTINUED
TO OPPOSE GIVING THE OTHER SIDE ANY INDICATION OF WILLINGNESS
TO RECATEGORY, AND BOTH SEE THIS IMPLICATION IN THE THIRD
US GOAL OF AN AGREED DEFINITION. FRG REP PROPOSED A "COMPROMISE"
PARA TO REPLACE THE THIRD US GOAL. ACTION REQUESTED: SEE PARA 12.
END SUMMARY

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05305 01 OF 02 301241Z

1. SPC ON SEPTEMBER 29 CONTINUED ITS DISCUSSION OF
GUIDANCE TO AHG ON DEFINITION OF FORCES BEGUN AT THE SEPTEMBER
25 MEETING (REF A). BASIS OF DISCUSSION WAS THE DRAFT TEXT
TRANSMITTED REF B.

2. UK REP (LOGAN) SAID UK HAD A STRONG WISH THAT PARA 4C AND 5 BE DELETED, AND THAT THE FOLLOWING BE INSERTED AS THE BEGINNING OF PARA 6: "AS REGARDS THE THREE TYPES OF FORCES RAISED BY THE EAST, - GROUND BASED AREA AIR DEFENSE, HELI-COPTER AND SSM PERSONNEL - WAYS WILL HAVE TO BE FOUND TO RESOLVE THE DIFFICULTIES IN THESE THREE SPECIFIC CASES. THE ALLIES ARE WILLING TO DISCUSS THE THREE FORCE ANOMALIES CITED BY THE EAST FURTHER AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME. HOWEVER, NO JUDGMENT CAN BE MADE UNTIL THE RELEVANT DATA HAVE BEEN MADE AVAILABLE AND IT IS POSSIBLE TO ASSESS THE NUMERICAL EFFECTS OF THE CATEGORIZATION ON OVERALL FORCES TOTALS. IT IS NOT SUFFICIENT ..." (FROM THIS POINT, PARA 6 IS UNCHANGED).

3. USREP (MOORE) POINTED OUT THAT THE EFFECTS OF THIS UK AMENDMENT WOULD BE TO POSTPONE THE DISCUSSION ON ANOMALIES UNTIL THE EAST HAD PROVIDED DATA. HE AGAIN STATED US REASONS FOR THE APPROACH IN PARA 4C, EMPHASING THE NEED TO DEAL WITH THE ANOMALIES THE EAST HAS RAISED, IN ORDER NOT TO GIVE THE EAST AN EXCUSE TO REFUSE THE DATA EXCHANGE WHICH THE UK SEEKS, AND IN ORDER TO HELP PROVIDE A FRAMEWORK RE THE SCOPE OF FORCES. HE STRESSED THAT PARA 4C DID NOT STATE THAT THE ALLIES WOULD AGREE TO A PARTICULAR APPROACH, AND IN FACT PARA 4C AND 5 PREJUDICED NO POSITION. HE ALSO OBSERVED THAT SINCE SPC WAS NOW WORKING WITH A BRACKETED TEXT, THE NEXT VERSION OF THIS TEXT SHOULD CONTAIN IN PARA 4C AFTER "SSM PERSONNEL" THE PHRASE: "BUT ONLY AS REGARDS THESE THREE TYPES OF FORCES." HE REVIEWED THE REASONS FOR THIS PHRASE.

4. FRG REP (HOYNCK) CHARACTERIZED UK AMENDMENT AS AN ATTEMPT TO STOP THE DEBATE IN VIENNA, AND SIAD FRG WISHES TO LEAVE LEEWAY TO AHG, WITHOUT COMMITTING AHG TO ANY ONE COURSE OF ACTION.

5. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) SAID CANADA, LIKE THE US AND FRG,
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05305 01 OF 02 301241Z

WISHED TO CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION IN VIENNA. THIS WAS IN ALLIED INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO ALLIED GOALS OF GETTING AN EXCHANGE OF DATA. HE REITERATED CANADIAN VIEW THAT PARA 4C IS NOT A GOAL IN THE SAME SENSE AS PARAS 4A AND B, AND COULD BETTER STAND ON ITS OWN AS A SEPARATE PARAGRAPH. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) SAID THE HAGUE HAD EXPRESSED A PREFERENCE FOR KEEPING PARA 4C, BUT AS A SEPARATE PARA, WITH THE FRG ENDING TO THE FIRST SENTENCE IN THE PARA (PARA 10, REF A): "... WAYS WILL HAVE TO BE FOUND TO RESOLVE THE DIFFICULTIES IN THESE THREE SPECIFIC CASES".

6. UK REP SIAD THE INTERPRETATION WAS CORRECTED THAT THE PURPOSE OF THE UK AMENDMENT WAS TO END THE DISCUSSION

ON ANOMALIES IN VIENNA UNTIL THERE WAS AN EXCHANGE OF DATA. FRG REP SAID THAT IN ADDITION TO THE REASONS PREVIOUSLY STATED FOR CONTINUING THE DEBATE, THERE WAS THE IMPACT IT WOULD HAVE ON PUBLIC OPINION IF THE EAST WERE ABLE TO CLAIM THAT THE ALLIES HAD BROKEN OFF DISCUSSION OF REDEFINITION. THIS WOULD WEAKEN THE VERY STRONG PUBLIC POSTURE THE ALLIES HAVE ON THE DATA ISSUE.

7. FRG AND UK REPS CONTINUED TO OPPOSE THE US WORDING IN PARA 4C AS PREJUDICING AGAINST AN OUTCOME WHERE THERE WOULD BE NO REDEFINITION WHATEVER. BOTH SAID THAT THEIR AUTHORITIES REGARD THE US PHRASE "BUT ONLY AS REGARDS THESE THREE TYPES OF FORCES" AS IMPLYING ALLIED WILLINGNESS TO RECATEGORIZE, BY HIGHLIGHTING THE THREE ANOMALIES IN QUESTION. US REP NOTED THAT FOOTNOTE 2 IN PARA 4 WARNED THAT A PURELY FUNCTIONAL APPROACH TO FORCE DEFINITION COULD LEAD TO MANIPULATION OF FORCE CATEGORIES, THEREBY COMPLICATING ALLIED EFFORTS TO PURSUE FUNDAMENTAL GOALS. IT WOULD BE A SIGNIFICANT ADVANCE FOR THE EAST TO AGREE EVEN INFORMALLY THAT THE ONLY CANDIDATES FOR ANY REDEFINITION, IF THERE WERE ONE, WOULD BE THESE THREE ANOMALIES.

8. FRG REP SUGGESTED THE FOLLOWING "COMPROMISE" LANGUAGE, BASED ON ELIMINATING PARA 4C AS A SEPARATE PARA, AND INCORPORATING ELEMENTS OF PARA 4C IN PARA 5: "AS REGARDS THE 3 TYPES OF FORCES RAISED BY EAST - GROUND BASED TERRITORIAL (I.E. AREA) AIR DEFENSE, HELICOPTER AND SSM PERSONNEL - WAYS WILL HAVE TO BE FOUND TO RESOLVE THE DIFFICULTIES IN THESE 3
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05305 01 OF 02 301241Z

SPECIFIC CASES. HOWEVER, NO JUDGMENT CAN BE MADE UNTIL THE RELEVANT DATA HAVE BEEN MADE AVAILABLE AND IT IS POSSIBLE TO ASSESS THE NUMERICAL EFFECT OF THE CATEGORIZATION ON OVERALL FORCE TOTALS. CONSEQUENTLY, ALLIED RECOGNITION OF THE NEED TO RESOLVE THE DIFFICULTIES IN THESE 3 SPECIFIC CASES DOES NOT CONNOTE ALLIED AGREEMENT AS TO THE SPECIFIC DISPOSITION OF EACH OF THE 3 CASES. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD EMPHASIZE THAT SOLUTIONS OTHER THAN THOSE SUGGESTED BY THE EAST CAN BE ENVISAGED." (THIS WOULD BE THE NEW PARA 5, AND WOULD NOT APPEAR AS A GOAL UNDER PARA 4.)

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 05305 02 OF 02 301252Z

46

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 NRC-05 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /088 W

----- 049133

O P 301137Z SEP 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3783

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 5305

9. US REP SAID THAT THIS PARA WOULD NOT TAKE THE AHG MUCH BEYOND EXISTING GUIDANCE. UK REP EXPRESSED INTEREST IN THE PARA. FRG REP THOUGHT THE PARA WOULD MAKE A LITTLE CLEARER THEN PRESENT GUIDANCE TO THE AHG THE NEED FOR A DATA EXCHANGE. HE SAID THAT THE DRAFT GUIDANCE THE SPC WAS NOW CONSIDERING WAS ONLY A HALF STEP. THE SPC WILL STILL NEED TO ADDRESS THE LONG TERM QUESTION OF WHAT PARTICULAR SOLUTION TO THE ANOMALIES QUESTION IS IN THE ALLIED INTEREST.

10. COMMENT: UK IS ISOLATED IN ITS EXTREME POSITION, AND WE EXPECT THAT AT NEXT MEETING UK WILL SUPPORT THE FRG WORDING IN PARA 8 ABOVE. BOTH UK AND FRG ARE OPPOSED TO GIVING THE OTHER SIDE ANY INDICATION OF WILLINGNESS TO RECATEGORIZE, AND BOTH SEE THIS IMPLICATION IN THE US WORDING.

THIS APPEARS TO BE THE CONSIDERED POSITION OF UK AND FRG. UK IN PAST MONTHS HAS MADE NO SECRET OF ITS STRONG MISGIVINGS ABOUT REDEFINITION OF FORCES, AND THIS IS REFLECTED IN THE UK PAPER ON REDEFINITION GIVEN TO THE US BILATERALLY.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05305 02 OF 02 301252Z

FRG APPEARS SOMEWHAT MORE FORTHCOMING ON THIS ISSUE. NEVERTHELESS, FRG SEES FIRM LINK BETWEEN REDEFINITION AND SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS; IN ITS OWN PAPER, FRG STATED THAT WORK ON THE TWO QUESTIONS SHOULD PROCEED TOGETHER, AND EXPRESSED PREFERENCE FOR AHG DISCUSSION OF DEFINITION WHICH WOULD NOT SET ANY PRECEDENT FOR THE STRUCTURE OF THE COMMON CEILING (REF D). SINCE FRG IS STILL WORKING ON ITS POSITION ON THE SERVICE SUB-CEILING QUESTION, WE CAN EXPECT CONTINUED FRG CAUTION ON REDEFINITION OF FORCES.

11. WE THEREFORE DOUBT THAT UK AND FRG WILL BE PREPARED AT THIS TIME TO GO MUCH BEYOND THE FRG REPLACEMENT OF PARA 4C STATED IN PARA 8 ABOVE. WE BELIEVE THAT IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO GET EARLY GUIDANCE TO VIENNA ENABLING AHG TO CALL FOR AGREEMENT TO GOALS OF AN AGREED DEFINITION PER

PARAS 4A AND 4B, ON WHICH SPC HAS AGREED. WE SUGGEST THAT THE
US PROPOSE AT OCTOBER 2 SPC MEETING TWO CHANGES IN THE FRG PARA 5
CONTAINED IN PARA 8 ABOVE: 1) REPLACE "DIFFICULTIES" BY
"ANOMALIES"; AND 2) AFTER "SSM PERSONNEL" INSERT "BUT ONLY
AS REGARDS THESE 3 TYPES OF FORCES". WE WOULD JUDGE THAT THE
FIRST OF THESE TWO CHANGES WOULD HAVE A GREATER CHANCE
OF ACCEPTANCE THAN THE SECOND. SPC SHOULD THEN BE IN A POSITION
TO COMPLETE WORK ON THE TEXT AT OCTOBER 6 MEETING,
WITH NAC APPROVAL OCTOBER 8. END COMMENT

12. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE, IN LIGHT OF ABOVE COMMENT,
IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING THURSDAY, OCTOBER. STREATOR

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 30 SEP 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: greeneet
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO05305
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197509102/abbrzmgc.tel
Line Count: 231
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 5257 DTG 261040Z SEP 75; B) USNATO 5208 DTG 241521Z SEP 75; C) STATE 224489 DTG 192339Z SEP 75; D) USNATO 5059 DTG 171433Z SEP 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 10 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <10 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <10 OCT 2003 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: DEFINITION OF FORCES: SPC MEETING SEPTEMBER 29
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006